



STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION STAFF LEGISLATIVE BILL ANALYSIS

DRAFT

Date Amended:	03/29/05	Bill No:	AB 588
Tax:	Local Sales and Use	Author:	Goldberg & Koretz
Related Bills:	SB 143 (Runner)		

BILL SUMMARY

This bill would require state agencies that prepare and maintain data and statistics on cities, to make a separate breakdown of the community of Hollywood.

Summary of Amendments

Since the previous analysis, this bill was amended to make technical, non-substantive changes to the geographic description of the community of Hollywood.

ANALYSIS

Current Law

Since 1976, pursuant to Section 11093 of the Government Code, the Department of Finance, the State Department of Health Services, and the Department of Transportation have been required, in the preparation and maintenance of any statistical analyses of cities, to make a separate breakdown of the San Fernando Valley. The City of Los Angeles is required to provide all necessary data. However, other state agencies were not required to prepare or maintain any statistical information by city unless: (1) information was currently being prepared or maintained by city; or (2) a state agency voluntarily prepared or maintained information by city.

Effective January 1, 2005, the passage of Assembly Bill 2207 (Chapter 181, Statutes 2004) requires any state agency or department that develops and maintains data and statistics on the municipal level to make a separate breakdown of the San Fernando Valley in the preparation and maintenance of any statistical analyses by city, and authorizes state agencies to require the City of Los Angeles to provide all necessary data. If the use of a tax area code is required in order to make a separate breakdown of the San Fernando Valley, then an alternate method may be used to determine the separate breakdown of the San Fernando Valley. Also under current law, the Controller may, upon request in a motion adopted by the City Council of the City of Los Angeles, designate additional statistical areas within the City of Los Angeles, except that the statistical areas shall not exceed three in number.

Under current Bradley-Burns Uniform Local Sales and Use Tax Law, the Board is required to collect and maintain local tax data by city, county, or city and county. Under current Transactions and Use Tax Law, the Board is required to collect and maintain local tax data by special taxing district. The Board, in its annual report, publishes the following statistical data: (1) State Sales and Use Tax Statistics by County; (2) Revenues Distributed to Cities and Counties From Local Sales and Use Taxes; (3) Revenues Distributed to Counties From County Transportation Tax; and (4) Revenues Distributed to Special Districts From Transactions and Use Tax.

This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the Board's formal position.

The Board publishes both a quarterly and annual booklet titled “Taxable Sales in California (Sales & Use Tax).” The booklets are a quarterly or annual report on retail sales activity in California. These reports provide taxable sales data by: (1) Statewide Taxable Sales, By Type of Business; (2) Taxable Sales, By County; (3) Taxable Sales in the 36 Largest Counties, By Type of Business; (4) Taxable Sales in the 22 Smallest Counties, By Type of Business; (5) Taxable Sales in the 272 Largest Cities, By Type of Business; and (6) Taxable Sales in All Cities Except the 272 Largest. Both the quarterly and annual reports are available on the Board’s website at www.boe.ca.gov.

Proposed Law

This bill would add Section 11093.4 to the Government Code to provide that any state agency or department that develops and maintains data and statistics on the municipal level, would be required to make a separate breakdown of the community of Hollywood. This bill also provides that if the use of a tax area code is required in order to comply with the provisions of this bill, an alternate method may be used to determine the separate breakdown of the community of Hollywood. This bill would also require the City of Los Angeles to provide all necessary data.

COMMENTS

- 1. Sponsor and purpose.** This bill is sponsored by the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce. According to the sponsor of the bill, the community of Hollywood has turned a corner from the crime and dilapidation that plagued the area for decades and, today, is attracting close to \$1 billion in new development. The Hollywood Chamber of Commerce now receives numerous requests each month for information on the community. Developers, entrepreneurs interested in opening businesses, civic and education leaders as well as residents are requesting specific data on Hollywood’s population, median income, employment, housing stock, general land use, tourism and infrastructure. However, the critical data and information is often scattered among multiple city agencies and departments, not reported on a regular basis, or is not collected at all. The difficulty or, sometimes, impossibility of gathering information in a timely manner often jeopardizes bringing major development and is a barrier to planning and to promoting Hollywood’s economic and social growth.
- 2. The March 29, 2005 amendments** corrected street names that had been misspelled.
- 3. To develop data using the Board’s tax area code system would be costly.** As previously stated, the Board maintains two types of data by city and county: distributions of local sales and use tax revenues and taxable sales. This information is collected and maintained using a tax area code system. All registered permit holders are assigned a tax area code. A tax area code is a twelve (12) digit number that identifies the city and county in which the account is located, as well as any special districts or redevelopment areas. All newly incorporated cities are assigned a tax area code.

To implement the provisions of this bill using the Board’s existing system, and not an alternative method as this bill allows, the Board would have to treat the community of

This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the Board’s formal position.

Hollywood as a newly incorporated city. This would require creating a special tax area code for the community of Hollywood. Once the tax area code is established, the Board would have to identify all accounts within the community of Hollywood. The Board requires all newly incorporated cities to furnish maps and listings of street addresses. The Board would have to print out all accounts currently within the City of Los Angeles and the surrounding areas. Using the street listings provided by the City of Los Angeles, Board staff would have to compare each business address from the Board's records to the city's street listing to identify those accounts within the community of Hollywood.

Once the accounts have been identified, each account must be changed on the Board's registration system. This would require changing the tax area code, entering comments regarding the nature of the changes made, and other minor modifications. When changes have been made to the registration system, a listing of all accounts that were changed, as well as copies of maps and street listings, are forwarded to the appropriate district offices for distribution to personnel responsible for registration of new accounts.

Other tasks associated with establishing the new area for the community of Hollywood include: preparing written guidelines for audit and compliance staff; designing and printing a special mailer to be mailed with the tax returns to all affected accounts, and revising various forms and publications.

4. **"Alternate method" for the San Fernando Valley.** Prior to the enactment of last year's Assembly Bill 2207, Board staff met with the author's staff to discuss how it prepared statistical data on cities. Board staff explained to the author's office that to use a tax area code to make a separate breakdown for the San Fernando Valley would be too costly. The author's staff recommended amending the bill to provide that, in the case where a tax area code is used in making a separate breakdown for the San Fernando Valley, an alternate method may be used instead. The Board staff explained that, if the City of Los Angeles were to compile data on the San Fernando Valley, with the Board performing a minimal amount of verification, such work could be done with insignificant costs (i.e., under \$10,000) to the Board. However, any other method that would require the Board to compile all the data would result in significant costs to the Board. The Board staff explained that it would publish the data provided the City of Los Angeles in its "Taxable Sales in California (Sales and Use Tax)" publication.

As previously stated, the Board develops taxable sales data on a city level. This data is published in the Board's publication, titled "Taxable Sales in California (Sales and Use Tax)." This data is developed using a tax area code. In the case of San Fernando Valley, the taxable sales data that will be published in this report will have been prepared using an alternate method. In addition, this data will have been provided by the City of Los Angeles, with only minimal verification performed by the Board. The taxable sales data on the San Fernando Valley will also contain a footnote referencing that the source of the data is the City of Los Angeles. A footnote regarding the source of the data is necessary because the Board will not be preparing the data.

- 4. This bill presents the same concerns for the Board that the San Fernando Valley bill did.** This bill requires state agencies that develop data and statistics on a city level to make a separate breakdown for the community of Hollywood. As previously stated (see comment 2), the Board develops taxable sales data of cities using a tax area code. This data is published in the Board's booklet titled, "Taxable Sales in California (Sales & Use Tax)." As previously stated, to make a separate breakdown of the community of Hollywood using a tax area code would be too costly. In addition, to modify the Board's computer system in order to capture data using another method would be equally as costly.

The problem with using an alternate method, with the City of Los Angeles providing all necessary data, is that it is data that is not prepared by the Board. The data is primarily prepared by the City of Los Angeles, with minimal verification performed by the Board. This data would be published in the Board's Taxable Sales in California publication; however, there would be a footnote stating that the data was developed from a source other than the Board. It seems that the purpose of the bill is to have reliable data developed for a specified statistical area, and to the extent feasible to require state agencies already collecting data by city, to collect data for a new statistical area. The problem is that the Board's existing system cannot be reasonably modified to collect data using another method. This means that in order to keep the costs at a minimum, the community of Hollywood, like the community of San Fernando Valley, will prepare the data with minimal verification performed by the Board. This data will then be published in the Board's Taxable Sales publication.

- 5. Is legislation necessary?** Under current law, the Controller may, upon request in a motion adopted by the City Council of the City of Los Angeles, designate additional statistical areas within the City of Los Angeles, except that the additional statistical areas shall not exceed three in number. Perhaps the author should first attempt making a request to the City of Los Angeles and the Controller before pursuing legislation?
- 6. Related Legislation.** Senate Bill 143 (Runner) would require state agencies that prepare and maintain data and statistics on cities, to make a separate breakdown of the Antelope Valley, and would require the Counties of Kern and Los Angeles to provide all necessary data.

COST ESTIMATE

This bill would require all state agencies that collect and maintain data on a city level to make a separate breakdown for the community of Hollywood. However, where a tax area code is required to comply with the provisions of the bill, an alternate method may be used. This bill would require the City of Los Angeles to provide all necessary data.

As long as the City of Los Angeles is providing all necessary data, with minimal review performed by the Board, the Board's costs would be insignificant (i.e., under \$10,000).

REVENUE ESTIMATE

This bill would not impact the state's revenues.

Analysis prepared by:	Debra A. Waltz	324-1890	04/25/05
-----------------------	----------------	----------	----------

Contact:	Margaret S. Shedd	322-2376
mcc		

0588-2dw.doc